Gravatt, Dan

From: West Lake Landfill / Bridgeton Landfill CAG <westlakecag@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2014 8:35 AM
To: West Lake Landfill Cag
Subject: Minutes Aug 11, 2014 CAG Meeting
Attachments: CAG Meeting 8 11 2014.pdf

see attachment to review.

--
Thank you - West Lake Landfill / Bridgeton Landfill Community Advisory Group
www.WestLakeCAG.org

West Lake/Bridgeton Landfill Community Advisory Group

August 11, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Meeting called to order at 6:40 by Doug Clemens.

Roll Call of Exec Board in attendance:

Chair: Doug Clemens
Co-Chair: Bob Nowlin
Treasurer: Rhonda Steelman
Secretary: Vernita Wilson
Members At Large: Lynn Leake and Bill Wilson

New Members nomination: Ellen Wortham, and Charles Murray.
Lynn Leake motioned to accept, David Kershman seconded.

Other attendees/organizations representatives in attendance:
Ben Washburn, EPA Community Involvement Coordinator, Region 7
Mary Petersen, Daniel Gravatt, Jeff Field, EPA Region 7
Ed Smith, Safe Energy Director, MO Coalition for the Environment
Ferd Fetsch and Linda Eaker, Bridgeton City Council
Robyn Kiefer, Jason Liebert, and Dan Corbett, US Army Corps of Engineers
Erin Harmon, CDC/ATSDR
Harvey Ferdman, Policy Advisor for Bill Otto
Terrie Boguski, TASC
Jacob Barker, St Louis Post Dispatch
Lorena Locke, Elizabeth Semkiw, DHSS
John Haasis, St Louis Comm. Health-Solid Waste
David Kolarik, USACE
Matt LaVanchy, Pattonville Fire District
Carl Stelzer, Journalist
Ryan Tilley, St Charles Co Dept. of Health

Doug thanked everyone for coming and being supportive.

Approval of minutes from July CAG meeting: Doug recommended minutes be approved as written, Bill Wilson seconded.

Old Business: At the recent CAG board meeting, it was unanimously decided that we would hold on the letter that was authored by Chuck Bell, a member in good standing and local resident, in which he is asking for the resignation or removal of Karl Brooks, Director of Region 7. We can't say we disagree with Chuck Bell on this but do feel the CAG's purview is slightly overstepped here. This office is a presidential appointment and we are in the middle of another presidential election year. We had a vote which was 14 to zero which shows that the community is expressing anger and disappointment with the EPA. We will let the motion stand and table the letter, which may be presented in the future.

Treasury Report by Rhonda Steelman for month of July:

REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF Westlake Landfill / Bridgeton Landfill Community Advisory Group FOR THE Month Ending: July 31, 2014

Receipts.	June 20, 2014	Balance	$ 383.97
Donations		Total	$ 70.00
Disbursements.		Total.....	$ 57.42
Balance on hand July31, 2014			$ 396.55
Montgomery Bank			$ 372.58
PayPal			$ 23.08

New business: Chuck Bell expressed a need to have a siren installed again in Spanish Village, since this is the part of the plan when there is a need to notify the residents with a warning message. Matt LaVanchy confirmed this need since the Fire Department also sees this as a necessity. A petition in the Spanish Village is encouraged to get support for this need for a new siren. Doug asked for any volunteers to help with the collection of names for the petition.

Ben Washburn: Part of his job is to be sure the agency is hearing and listening to your concerns. Previously, we have had Dan Gravatt go over the questions verbatim and give answers. We want to provide a more engaging presentation for you so we have another person to lead our presentation. Our response to the big list of CAG questions is available on-line or contact me with any questions.

Mary Petersen with EPA: Mary introduced herself, spoke of her 24 years of experience with EPA, and 20 years as a Superfund Project Manager. She mentioned that she has worked with the Superfund Emergency Response Fund and wants to build community support as EPA makes decisions regarding remedial work.

She gave a summary of the responses to the BMAC comments from last meeting. An update was issued on July 31st which is on the website.

The main message is that EPA's messages regarding the suitability of the park were based on existing data and then the EPA conducted the gamma screening to have more to base their decision on. Each time, the messages were re-crafted based on research gathered up to that time. Data needs to be held to the highest standards and she said we agree with that. The gathering of data and review sometimes takes a while to get to the correct evaluation. They try to be as accurate as possible.

In response to the citations regarding the error for certain instruments used in the evaluation process, Mary talked about the digital reading versus a needle meter reading which could have more human error.

She also mentioned the calibration methods used in research with the pressurized iron chamber. EPA calibrated the equipment, and once in the field, the operators did response checks twice daily to check the calibration.

Regarding the soil samples, look at the website to see the data tables there. The report was released on July 31st and includes results from the over 100 soil samples taken at Koch Park, Blanchette Park, and BMAC. The samples collected in these three parks were consistent and none of the samples contained detections of irregular nuclides at a level of concern.

The Army Corp of Engineers is progressing on looking at the coordinates for the isolation barrier. We have augmented our resources by reaching into other departments of EPA, the EPA's Office of Research and Development, the US Geological Survey, and the Army Corps of Engineers.

What is the path to get to a ROD amendment? (Doug shared that there is a fact sheet available for those wanted to know this process. TASC Fact Sheet #1, Feb 2014). Mary showed a slide presentation for the steps involved.

Regarding a list of activities EPA has currently underway regarding this project, visit the website, look at the newly added ***The Path Ahead*** and look at what's currently going on and what are the things coming up. It is updated monthly.

Decisions are based on sound science. Additional technical expertise is given by the Army Corps.

Q&A:

Debbie Disser: Information I've read says that soil sampling should be done deeper when there's gardening, aerating fields, turning over the dirt when working on the fields, etc. Why did you not go down 4-6 inches when testing the soil at BMAC, rather than just 2 inches?

Mary: We will address further information on that after research. A quick answer would be that surface soil sampling is generally 0-2 inches. BMAC is not residential but for recreational use.

David Kershman: David spoke up against EPA presentation, mentioning that it is a concern to send a message that something is safe when the data has not all been collected.

Mary: In the absence of EPA not collecting data initially, we evaluated the data that had been collected by others. Statements were appropriate for the data that we had. We want to get out messages that are appropriate. Our statements can be more definitive with the more information we gather.

David: You stated digital is much more accurate than analog, although needles are on the digital equipment. I don't agree that digital is more accurate than analog.

Mary: I will try to get clarification from field personnel who actually read the instruments.

Mary: Concern was to do with needle swing resulting in a 50 % error and human interpretation as to what that needle swing was conveying. We can look into that by checking with the field personnel who handled that.

David: There's a mirror behind the needle to help see results. Last comment is that you say it's very difficult to predict timelines. Mile markers and deadlines are necessary when working with projects. Sometimes I have to push those schedules and change the deadline but there needs to be mile markers in order to see progress.

Doug: PRP's also add to the completion time for a project, could you explain how that affects that?

Mary: Timelines do tend to move quicker when it is a fund-lead project. That only occurs at sites where we do not have a potentially responsible party, with contractors involved, etc. Schedules are on ***The Path Ahead,*** there are certain things we can do a better job doing. Design submittals will have a schedule. There are pieces of the process that can have better deadlines, as long as we don't set false expectations.

David: We would like to hear more than "we're working on it."

Doug: ***The Path Ahead*** is a very good concept. We don't mind a little minutia in ***The Path Ahead.***

Ed Smith: There was information missed in the Supplemental Supplemental Feasibility Study. Why was a decision made by Region7 and then sent to the National Remedy Review Board?

Dan Gravatt: The NRRB wanted a broader review. We did not make a decision before going to them.

Dawn Chapman: Where does the community fit in? It sounds like Superfund is designed to be like a triangle with the company, the EPA, and the community dealing with the site. There's a lot of community input. Shouldn't we get to see the proposed plan?

Dan: The public will get another chance to give input during public meetings, public comment, after EPA presents the plan they want to propose.

Dawn: So we can approve or disapprove of a plan but what happens if the community rejects the plan?

Dan: It depends on what the alternatives are and what your specific objections are. State and community criteria are two things needed in making a decision.

Dawn: Could you send out that list or link?

Mary: It should be on the form that Terrie put out.

Beth Strohmeyer: How many times has EPA changed the ROD (Record of Decision)?

Dan: Neither Mary nor I know the answer. There are changes occurring in the process. After the ROD has been formally written up, we revisit it. How many times has it been changed since the beginning? We can look into that.

Mary: KC community had concerns about the plan proposed and redone to present a modified plan in a year or two.

Chuck: Can we ask the Army Corps of Engineers a question? How deep would you go to test the soil if you had a concern? What is your operating procedure for the depth of soil testing?

Robyn Kiefer: The answer is that it depends on what activity is being done on the site. Zero to two is what is normally taken on a ball field where what they are going to be exposed to sliding, kicking up dust; so in my opinion, that was an appropriate sample depth.

Lynn Leake: I've coached for many years. On ball fields, the pegs for bases go down 8 inches. I beg to differ with the depth decision on those ball fields.

Dan: That is a tiny percentage of the area the kids are running around on.

Jenny Turner: Was the EPA or the Corp involved in putting the waste in Westlake?

Doug: This waste was left to dry on Latty Avenue just outside the airport, given/sold to Cotter Corp, who sold some to Colorado, then the market fell out. They came in to say you are due to clean this up in 1973. By October 1973, B-K Construction sent bulldozers and dump-trucks who brought the waste to the landfill.

Jenny: Then if they didn't put it in, why is EPA in charge of pulling it out?

Ed: The reason the EPA is handling the Westlake Landfill is because the Dept. of Energy was in charge of what is called the Formerly Utilized Site Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) in 1990 in St Louis which is now under the control of the Corp. When the DOE was here establishing which sites in St Louis would be FUSRAP sites, it explicitly left Westlake Landfill off the list and a month or two later, it became a national priority listing with the EPA. We think it should be a FUSRAP site but it's not.

Harvey Ferdman: The NRRB, do citizens have access to that group? Do they ever entertain citizens coming to them directly and talking about the sites?

Dan: To the best of my knowledge, citizens cannot be a formal part of the process of NRRB.

Harvey: Would they entertain a citizen group talking to the NRRB directly without the presence of the EPA?

Dan: Could the CAG or another citizen group meet with the ORS? I'm sure that does not happen.

Ed: Can we get a confirmation on that, please?

Mary: We can look into that.

Carl Stelzer: Does EPA know whether or not the "fire" in the landfill has hit the radioactive waste?

Doug: One of the community-funded radiation detection systems had a spike at the same time the odors broke in the area. One of the concerns is that the waste has contacted the fire. Do you know this? Can you tell us?

Dan: We have no evidence that that fire is anywhere near the RIM even in the extended area that reaches to the bounds to the southwest of the transfer station.

Ed: Regarding the discovery of radioactive materials in the south, has EPA released all the updated maps with the scientifically blended data collected for the isolation barrier? If it hasn't, will it? Would you equally do the same with the next round of testing? This is in reference to a letter from federally elected officials.

Dan: We have not received a formal submission from the PRP's yet that shows us all the laboratory and the litigable data along with the validation they've done for the GCPT and quarry data that was done so far that identified the newly discovered gray area in the southwest near the transfer station. We know there's going to an additional phase to finish finding where that stuff ends. Once we have that investigation complete, we will share that data with you all.

Ed: How long has it been since the last round of testing by the PRP's?

Dan: Last quarry/GCPT work was completed in March/April. Next phase of investigation depends on where we decide the barrier will be built.

Bob: Related to the PRP's, they have their own engineer doing their research that they give the PRP's. Do you see EMSI's report before it goes to the PRP's, or do you only see their data after it's been processed thru the PRP's? Do you get the raw data that EMSI comes up with or do you get it after the PRP's have changed it? There is some concern that the information the engineer submits is not what is turned over to you.

Doug: EMSI is the engineer contractor for Republic Services and for the PRP's fund site.

Dan: We do see raw, raw, raw data that comes from analytical laboratories that are subcontracted that are independent of EMSI, independent of the PRP's. For example, you have a Test-America over here at Earth City. There are companies like that that are completely independent. There are contract labs where you send that data. They have their own quality procedures that are independent of whoever they are working for. We also see the EMSI sub-contractor's quality assurance evaluation of that data which follows the EPA guidance and procedures for quality assured data. We also see the reports and interpretations that EMSI prepare based on that quality assured data and that is where reasonable people can differ. Do we see what EMSI writes before it goes to the PRP's? We do not because EMSI works for the PRPs and not for us, but having said that, regardless if it came from EMSI or the PRPS, or we see it in a report from EPA, Corps of Engineers, or USGS, if we see a problem with it, we will call them on it and they will need to fix it.

Bob: In terms of what engineering rhetoric comes out, the PRPs can manipulate it however they want to. Do you see that data to know whether they manipulate it or not? You base your decision off the PRP's information. How do we know or how do you know that the information has not been manipulated?

Dan: We do not base our decisions on PRP's recommendation. We look at their data and their evaluation of their data.

Bob: Part of that process is to review the PRP's recommendation. Are they misleading you? Do you have cross-checks when you do some of that checking yourself to know whether or not you are making your decision based on manipulated information?

Dan: We do our own independent evaluations of the raw data they provide. That's one of the reasons we have USGS and we have the Corp of Engineers. We satisfy ourselves that the data and raw data are representative and it is the data we need to make the decision but we evaluate it ourselves. Sometimes it ends up agreeing with their interpretation and sometimes it doesn't. If we didn't do this, we would be negligent in our jobs.

Doug: How would a disagreement with the PRP's analysis affect the time-line?

Dan: We would let them know that a particular statement, conclusion, or recommendation they may make is not valid or is not supported properly. They have to go fix it and we can't control the time. Any time we come to a non-meeting of the minds, the time-line would be affected somewhat dependent on the magnitude of the discrepancy.

Harvey: I understand there is a concept of a split sample used in some cases and an EPA person is there observing the taking of the sample and the sample is sent to an independent lab and also the lab the EPA uses. In this case, there are no split-samples happening. The only data you are getting is coming from the PRP's. It never goes from the lab to the EPA rep.

Dan: You are correct in the process for split sampling. We have not been collecting split samples of the core samples that the PRP's have recently been collecting at the potential barrier areas. When we get the raw data from the PRP's which comes from the analytical laboratories, we don't get a summary report but get the actual lab report in its entirety which is in a very standard format. We get a true copy sent to us so we don't have to wonder if the numbers have been altered, the lab's numbers or their calibrations are altered. We see the actual lab work and if we see any suspicions of alteration, we ask for an independent verification that this is what you actually sent to the PRP's.

Harvey: With this system, there is an opportunity to filter which samples you get to see. It is a situation where they have an opportunity to select which samples they are going to give you. I am not saying that is happening. I am not making any accusations.

Dan: That is why the PRP's were out there doing this work. We had an EPA person watching the entire process pulling the cores out of the ground, watching the scanning of the scintillation detectors to see if any particular strata in that core sample had a higher rate of beta or gamma omissions there. That's the checks and balances for the kinds of shenanigans you were talking about. That's why we're there watching to make sure they take samples that are representative.

Beth: I've heard a theme tonight from Dan saying, "We tell them to fix it", or "we tell them". Since they haven't found an area that is clean for the barrier, and they tested a site area that they found it in that wasn't supposed to be there, we know they are already putting wells in just north of the neck. Why can't you "tell them", while they are doing that, to test at the neck and move up for a clean line instead of way up here at the top of the south? Why aren't you telling them that?

Dan: I'm not sure which wells you're referring to.

Harvey: That's the three additional temperature monitoring wells immediately to the north of the neck. It would be a great opportunity to find if there's any radioactivity there.

Dan: They're not taking samples from that area, I would guess, and I am not intimately familiar with that so that would be a question for FDNR to find out how those TMP's are going to be installed since that is in their purview.

Doug: The MDNR has not ever attended a meeting even though invited several times. This site is split in terms of jurisdiction between the state of Missouri handling the regular landfill and the fire and the Superfund handling the radioactive materials. Sometimes agencies don't talk. Can the EPA say to the PRP's digging there, "we still don't know the end of this stuff so can we take samples there and place those into analysis?"

Dan: We haven't finalized the scope of exactly where and how many samples we are going to be taking and what methodology we are going to use to decide where we're going to take them. Since we are not ready to get out in the field and do that basic investigation, we are going to pass on taking samples at this time. That doesn't mean we can't consider that kind of approach in the future when we do

scope that work to get out in the field. I know that doesn't seem to satisfy your question but we're not ready to go take those samples at this time.

Tara: The two organizations are not talking. As a citizen, as a mother, as a nurse, as a childcare worker, this gentleman's question was overlooked when he said they changed the bases at the ball field and were going down 8 inches. A common sense question is would you want your child to be out there kicking up dust and why can't that soil be tested down 8 inches? If my child is playing ball out there regularly for 3-5, 6 years, and dust is being kicked up, can't that be tested for lead or whatever compound that is a concern? I know you mentioned statistics and all but I believe it is a good reason to test deeper. I thought that was insulting to bypass his question by going into statistics. If we can't do this for children who could make contact with something at a young age when their bodies are still developing and then have to deal with that at an older age.

Doug: You've given statistical exposure for that small amount of area for the bases. The community does have a concern for BMAC if there is any possibility of exposure. Wouldn't it be better to go down 8 inches if there is any possibility of contamination, if there is any possibility?

Mary: I didn't mean to be rude or dismiss anybody's issue but the genuine fact is that the surface areas where the bases are represents a really small fraction of the total surface area of the fields that were tested. I don't doubt that the base pegs go down 8 inches. The simple fact is that represents a really, really small fraction of what anybody could be exposed to at that facility. The surface soil sampling that was conducted, according to our protocol, was zero to two inches that was most representative of the exposures that would occur under the normal use scenario for that facility. That may not be entirely satisfying to you, I recognize that, but that is the response.

Woman from Coldwater Creek area: It was pretty much the same answer when they asked about water samples at BMAC, you checked it here, then there was a runoff there, and that wasn't checked but well, we just checked the surface. It was a whole conglomeration of feelings that the public had that you used to maneuver things. Due to our concerns, why didn't you do a health concern study instead of just testing the soil down 2 inches? Why didn't you use the PIC (Pressurized Ion Chamber) study? We saw a summary only at Blanchette Park and Koch Park. Can we have the full data set so we can compare that to BMAC?

Mary: I believe all the data for Koch and Blanchette should be in the report that was released. Taking soil data is actually a better indicator to use to draw conclusions from, so you wouldn't use the PIC. You would only use the PIC if you were not going to that measure of actually take soil samples.

Woman from Coldwater Creek area: The big concern for why we wanted to go deeper than 2 inches in the ground is that some of us grew up around the Coldwater Creek. They had to go down 20-25 feet to dig up contamination and it is the same stuff over at Westlake and BMAC. We are talking about haul roads and wind blowing. This stuff blew around, you don't know how far this stuff went, and where it will turn up.

Doug: This was a major haul route from St Louis to St Charles Rock Road all the way out to Weldon Springs. The route stops just a little bit north of here. FUSRAP has yet to go through the roads to check this.

Charles Murray: Are you aware that the maintenance people, when there's a big rain, turn 6-8 inches over bringing this up to the top when they are working on the fields? This is how they make the fields playable. Are you aware of that situation? I don't think so.

Doug: The EPA will follow up on that question.

Charles: That is how they make the field playable. I have been an umpire for years.

Mary: I am not aware of that situation. We can check with BMAC Director.

Another gentleman: That is a small area in the scope of things but that area is traveled 100 times more than any other part of the field. They are on the ground sliding into the dust at the bases. Why shouldn't we be responsible and be sure to protect our children? We want to be sure.

Dawn: I was looking at Blanchette Park. If you compare the samples, it said that there were some above the background threshold but none of it was above the remediation level. As long as it is above background but not above remediation level, is it okay depending on what it is used for? It looks like there were several of those samples that were elevated across the board for all three isotopes. They were above the background threshold.

Mary: But there is a difference between background thresholds and preliminary remediation levels. It would be good to have some discussion about the different goals. They don't all indicate a health concern. It might be above a background threshold level but below the level of concern.

Doug: One thing that confuses everyone is that agency to agency, those levels are different.

Dawn: This is my question, is there anything on that field? Is nuclear weapons waste on that field or anywhere there?

Terrie: Please prepare a background/remediation level explanation for us.

Harvey: At any specific level whether man-made or natural, what is the relative risk factor at different levels? Since remediation level seems to be background plus 5 or so? How did you get to that figure? What is the gradation that all of a sudden matters? There may be places where the background is high enough you don't want your kids playing there. What is the actual hard-risk factor? Let's cover the numbers typically found here.

Mary: I think this is a topic that needs a lot more discussion. There are really great questions.

Harvey: Give us some other common hazards – like chances to be hit by lightning, by a car, etc. Then I have something I can look at and get it. Probabilities.

Dan Finney: If we're saying that there were readings above background but below remediation, I understand it might have difference health implications depending upon what the levels are. Based upon your analyses, were you able to find fingerprint isotopes that could be traced back to WestLake? In other words, did you find the presence of material that could be traced back from Westlake onto BMAC premises?

Dan: There are no truly distinctive isotopes that were used by Mallinckrodt. They process naturally and occur in uranium ore. Uranium decays into a number of daughter products before it becomes a stabile isotope at the end of its decaying chain. All those isotopes, Uranium, Thorium, Lead 210, the isotopes of

the daughter products there in the middle, all occur naturally everywhere on earth in some concentration. There wasn't a particular isotope or element that Mallinckrodt used or made that would be a fingerprint, definitely traceable to Mallinckrodt. They are all naturally occurring to a greater or lesser concentration in any soil sample on earth.

Ed: We know the radioactivity in the landfill has radium ingrowth that has to catch up to the higher levels of thorium, so did you find radium where it would possibly increase the radioactivity over time to catch up with the thorium? That's not natural. It has to do with the chemical conversions used during the purification process for the Manhattan wastes that are at Westlake and were at Latty.

Dan: The concentrations we found are so low that there's no way to do that kind of ratio with any kind of accuracy.

Ed: We've seen EPA go to great lengths to let us know that radioactivity is everywhere. The EPA does not acknowledge that it uses the linear no-threshold model. This is the second time I've said this in a public meeting. The EPA endorses the EXPOSURE EQUALS RISK scenario when it comes to health and exposure to ionizing radiation. I would appreciate it if you would put as much effort into explaining the health exposure risk that EPA endorses as much as you do letting everyone know that radioactivity is everywhere.

Dan: We should have some health physicists come here to dig into these issues. Underlying all of the discussion points we have had tonight are the concerns you have for your health, your kids' health, and the health of your family, and we get that. I'm not a risk assessor or health physicist so we will work on turning that into a detailed discussion with the appropriate experts.

Ed: This is based on **the National Academy of Science and Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation Reports**. There are seven reports. Perhaps we could get someone from the there here.

Tara: At a previous meeting, you were asked if you would want your family to live here. You said "no." So when we are talking about these concerns, you should understand the health risks that we feel.

Dan: You have a good memory but I said "no" because of the smell. I don't know how you can stand that. I wouldn't want to live here because of the smell.

Dawn: We would encourage you to go down to significant depths of the soil next time. I understand that you didn't because you knew it was just sitting there. I realize that when something is not at remediation level, you can say that it's an anomaly but to be that close to WestLake, it's more than an anomaly. It's a big deal.

Kirby Pemberton: I have buried one child from (form of cancer). I have three children who all have health issues who played at BMAC. Don't tell me there are not health issues at that ballpark. You need to go further in the ground!

Bob: Most of us are not as interested in all the technical jargon. Many of you have studied this and understand it all. I think the key as part of this is as EPA, do you ever break protocol because the community is so concerned and do something for the community? My grandson plays ball at BMAC but I'm more concerned about where I have lived in Spanish Village for 37 years. I'm concerned about the aspects of concerns of living in this air for 37 years and the possibility that these concerns are legitimate. Do you ever break protocol and do something that your normal procedures say, "we can't do that" but

can you go the extra mile and do some of this testing because we are so concerned? It just doesn't go by "this is our standard" or "this is what we do". Are you willing to break away from this protocol to do something for the community because this is our real concern?

Mary: Yes, that is why we tested BMAC. We tested BMAC in response to the community's concerns about that ball field and we went far beyond what is normally done. We spent probably at least 5 times on that area as what we do for other sights that do pre-surface screenings so we have done a great deal in response for community concerns. I will take back your concerns that remain about BMAC, such as taking deeper soil samples. I will take that back to our management.

Bob: Is there a way that you can go ahead and test now and say "we'll have this as data to use later" instead of saying "we can't do this because the timeline is not right" and wait another three months? If they're digging those wells, why don't you get some soil samples there? It makes sense, if a hole is being dug, you can get some dirt out of it and test, then why can't you do it?

Dan: The machinery being used to install the temperature wells is not what we need to do that. We can't do that. It has not been scoped that so we cannot do that.

Doug: 8th of September is our next meeting.

Lois Gibbs will be here on Saturday, the 16th. There are RSVP forms here.

Thank you, everyone for your attention.

Meeting closed at 8:42 pm.

50 attended